

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/674,569	09/29/2003	Karthik Janakiraman	A6378C1/T45510	3855	
57385	7590 04/1	0006	EXAM	EXAMINER	
	ND AND TOWNS	ZERVIGO	ZERVIGON, RUDY		
EIGHTH FL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			1763		

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			h			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u></u>			
	10/674,569	JANAKIRAMAN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Rudy Zervigon	1763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence ad	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC , cause the application to become A	ICATION.  The reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of this companies to the companies of the c				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Ja	anuary 2006.					
· <u> </u>	a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeya ion is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CF				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in a rity documents have bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National	Stage			
	,					
Attachment(s)						
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/30/2006.</li> </ol>	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTC	)-152)			

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Metzner; Craig R. et al (US 6,454,860 B2).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Metzner teaches a gas distribution face plate (240; Figure 4; column 7, lines 33-50) comprising: a face plate (240; Figure 4; column 7, lines 33-50) body having a thickness (distance 249; Figure 7) defining a number of inlet orifices (249; Figure 7; column 9, lines 53-64) having a width (247; Figure 7; column 9, lines 53-64) and a depth (283, 249; Figure 7; column 9, lines 53-64), at least one of the number, the width (247; Figure 7; column 9, lines 53-64), and the depth (283, 249; Figure 7; column 9, lines 53-64) configured to create a uniform pressure drop of between about 0.8 and 1 Torr across edge and center regions of the face plate (240; Figure 4; column 7, lines 33-50) as gas is flowed through the inlet orifices (249; Figure 7; column 9, lines 53-64), whereby a thickness of material deposited at an edge of a wafer varies by 3% or less from a thickness of material deposited at a center of the wafer, when the wafer is separated from the face plate (240;

Application/Control Number: 10/674,569 Page 3

Art Unit: 1763

Figure 4; column 7, lines 33-50) by a gap of between about 75 and 450 mils, as claimed by claim 1. Applicant's claim limitations of "...configured to create a uniform pressure drop of between about 0.8 and 1 Torr across edge and center regions of the face plate (240; Figure 4; column 7, lines 33-50) as gas is flowed through the inlet orifices, whereby a thickness of material deposited at an edge of a wafer varies by 3% or less from a thickness of material deposited at a center of the wafer, when the wafer is separated from the face plate by a gap of between about 75 and 450 mils" are claim requirements of intended use. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter, 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPO at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. Additionally, it is believed the prior art apparatus is capable of performing the intended use. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey,152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02). When the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent (In re Best, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977); MPEP 2112.01).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toki, Masahiko et al. (JP 04154116 A). Toki Teaches a low pressure CVD apparatus (Figures 1,2)

Art Unit: 1763

including a face plate body 21 (abstract, Figure 1) with a pressure drop across said face plate

body 21 sufficient to provide "film thickness distribution is within 3%" (abstract).

Toki does not teach the wafer separation distance of 75 to 450 mills and the exact pressure drop

of 0.8 and 1Torr range accorss the face plate body 21. Toki further does not teach his face plate

body 21 with the number of orifices (25,26; Figure 1) between 2000 and 17,500 orifices and

where said orifices have widths between 0.010 and 0.018 inches as claimed by claims 2-5.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to optimize the dimensions and number of Toki's inlet orifices to optimize the claimed film

thickness variation resulting from the uniform pressure gradiant.

Motivation to optimize the dimensions and number of Toki's inlet orifices to optimize the

claimed film thickness variation resulting from the uniform pressure gradiant is for achieving

film thickness uniformity as taught by Toki (abstract). Further, it is well established that changes

in apparatus dimensions are within the level of ordinary skill in the art. (Gardner v. TEC

Systems, Inc., 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225

USPQ 232 (1984); In re Rose, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); In re Rinehart, 531

F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); See MPEP 2144.04). Further, it is well established that

the duplication of parts is obvious (In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960)

MPEP 2144.04).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed January 30, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Application/Control Number: 10/674,569 Page 5

Art Unit: 1763

6. In response to Applicant's position regarding the Metzner reference not showing certain claimed features, the Examiner believes these features are inherent.

### Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1442. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm. The official fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (571) 273-8300. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (571) 272-1700. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh, at (571) 272-1435.